

AMENDMENT TO THE DRAWINGS

A replacement drawing sheet is submitted for FIGS. 1-2 to include a Prior Art legend.

### REMARKS

This Amendment is in response to the Office Action mailed June 29, 2007. Claims 1-20 are pending in the application and are rejected. Applicants respond to the Office Action as follows.

#### **Response to Oath/Declaration**

In paragraph 3, the Office Action states that the oath or declaration is defective. A Substitute Declaration is submitted herewith in compliance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.52(c).

#### **Response to Drawing Objections**

In paragraph 4, the Office Action requires that FIGS. 1 and 2 include a –Prior Art—legend. Applicants submit herewith a replacement drawing sheet for FIGS. 1-2 in compliance with the Office Action requirement.

#### **Response to Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §112**

Claims 7 and 13-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112. Claims 15 and 19-20 are cancelled. Claims 7, 13-14 and 16-18 are amended and as amended are proper under 35 U.S.C. § 112. Based upon the foregoing, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

#### **Response to Double Patenting**

Claims 8-12 are objected to under 37 C.R.F. 1.75 as being substantial duplicates of claims 2-6. Claims 8-12 as amended are proper under 37 C.R.F. 1.75 and thus withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

#### **Response to Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §102**

##### Response to Rejection Based upon Schmitz – U.S. Patent No 5,235,482

Claims 1, 2, 4, 7-8, 10, 13, 14 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Schmitz. Claim 10 is cancelled.

Claims 1, 2 and 4 as amend recite *inter alia* an composite structure for a data storage device including an adhesive portion filling a space between at least one raised circuit component and an edge surface of at least one aperture of a base which as claimed is not taught nor suggested by Schmitz. In Schmitz, adhesive layer 104 does fill a space between at least one

raised circuit component and an edge surface of at least one aperture of the base as claimed. Dependent claims 2 and 4 further distinguish the claimed subject matter from Schmitz.

Claims 7 and 8 as amended recite *inter alia* a composite structure for a data storage device comprising a base, a printed circuit board including a board portion and at least one component extending from the board portion forming an upright surface of the printed circuit board, a first adhesive portion between the board portion and the base and a second adhesive portion between the upright surface of the printed circuit board and an upright surface of the base. In Schmitz adhesive layer 104 is not disposed between an upright surface of the printed circuit board and an upright surface of the base as claimed.

Claims 13, 14 and 16 as amended recite *inter alia* means for reinforcing at least one aperture of a base to form a stiff support structure. Means-plus-function language in a claim is interpreted to include embodiments disclosed in the specification and equivalents. As properly construed, Schmitz does not teach or suggest the recited means set forth in claims 13, 14 and 16.

Response to Rejection Based upon Shirotori – U.S. Patent No 4,818,907

Claims 1, 2, 7-8, 13-14, 16-17, 19 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Shirotori, U.S. Patent No. 4,818,907. Claims 19-20 are cancelled.

Claims 1 and 2 recite a base having a patterned surface structure for assembly of a drive motor and head actuator, a printed circuit board including at least one raised circuit component elevated from a board portion of the printed circuit board and the at least one raised circuit component extending into the at least one aperture on the second side of the base and an adhesive portion filling a space between the at least one raised circuit component and an edge surface of the at least one aperture of the base which is not taught by Shirotori. Shirotori discloses a motor hub or housing for a brushless motor, but does not disclose each of the recited claim elements of the composite structure.

Claims 7-8 recite a base having a patterned surface including a motor hub portion and a head actuator portion; a printed circuit board including a board portion and at least one component extending from the board portion forming an upright surface of the printed circuit board and a first adhesive portion between the board portion and the base and a second adhesive

portion between the upright surface of the printed circuit board and an upright surface of the base. As discussed above Shirotori discloses a motor hub or housing for a brushless motor but does teach each of the recited claim elements of the composite structure.

Claims 13-14 recite *inter alia* a base including a motor hub portion and an actuator portion and means for reinforcing at least one aperture of the base to form a stiff support structure which is not taught or disclosed by Shirotori.

Response to Rejection Based upon Yagi – U.S. Patent No 5,654,847

Claims 1, 7 and 13-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Yagi, U.S. Patent No. 5,654,847. As discussed above, Claim 1 recite *inter alia* a composite structure including an adhesive portion filling a space between at least one raised circuit component and an edge surface of at least one aperture of the base which as claimed is not taught by Yagi.

Claim 7 recite a composite structure including a printed circuit board including a board portion and at least one component extending from the board portion forming an upright surface of the printed circuit board and a first adhesive portion between the board portion and the base and a second adhesive portion between the upright surface of the printed circuit board and an upright surface of the base, which as claimed is not taught by Yagi.

Claims 13-15 recite means for reinforcing at least one aperture of the base to form a stiff support structure, which as properly construed, is not taught or suggest by Yagi.

**Response to Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §103**

Claims 17, 19 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Schmitz. Claims 19 and 20 are cancelled and claim 17 is dependent upon amended claim 13, which is allowable over Schmitz as discussed above on the basis that as properly construed Schmitz does not teach or suggest each of the recited claim limitations.

Claims 3, 5, 6, 9, 11 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Schmitz in view of Ojeda, U.S. Patent No. 6,958,884. Claims 3, 5 and 6 are dependent upon claim 1 and claims 9, 11, 12 are dependent upon claim 7, which as discussed above are patentable over Schmitz in view of Ojeda.

Claims 17-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Yagi, U.S. Patent No. 5,654,847. Claim 17 is dependent upon claim 13 and claim 18 is dependent upon claim 1 which as discussed above are patentable over Yagi.

New claims 21-24 are added. New claims 21-24 are readable on the elected Species II, corresponding to FIG. 4. Favorable action with respect to new claims 21-24 is respectfully requested. New claims 21-24 are supported by Applicants' Specification. See Applicants' Specification page 3, line 25 – page 4, line 9; page 4, lines 18-25; page 5, lines 3-9; and FIGS. 3-4.

The Director is authorized to charge any fee deficiency required by this paper or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 23-1123.

Respectfully submitted,

WESTMAN, CHAMPLIN & KELLY, P.A.

By: /Deirdre Megley Kvale/  
Deirdre Megley Kvale, Reg. No. 35,612  
900 Second Avenue South, Suite 1400  
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-3319  
Phone: (612) 334-3222 Fax: (612) 334-3312

DMK:rev